

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Applicant has amended claims 5 and 9, cancelled claims 18-20, amended the specification, and amended FIGS. 1-4. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Based upon the above amendments and the arguments below, Applicant submits that claims 1-17 are now in allowable form. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

DRAWINGS

At pages 2-3 of the Office, the Examiner objected to the drawings as to a number of formalities. In response, FIGS. 1-4 have been amended and labeled "REPLACEMENT SHEETS". Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner review, approve, and enter these revised drawings. The specific changes to the drawings are as follows: FIG. 1 has been amended to include a reference to the claimed spring 30 and the claimed piezoelectric element 32. FIG. 2 has been amended to shorten the lead lines for element 4. FIG. 3 has been amended to remove handwritten indicia and replace same with clearer indicia, remove element "g", and remove element "11". FIG. 4 has been amended to remove handwritten indicia and replace same with clearer indicia. In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the drawing is acceptable and the drawing objection should be withdrawn.

SPECIFICATION

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification, page 12, line 3 as containing a typographic error and as having a non-descriptive title. In response, Applicant has amended the specification to recite the proper dimensions of the liquid, i.e., to read "microleter", and to replace the title with a more descriptive title. Accordingly, Applicant requests the objections to the specification be withdrawn. Applicant has amended the specification at page 6 to correct the referenced dimensions as being for the diameter of the piston. Applicant has also amended the specification at page 12 to refer to the spring 30 and the piezoelectric element 32, which are now shown in FIG. 1.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 5 and 9 as to several informalities. In response, Applicant has amended these claims as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the claim objections be withdrawn.

DOUBLE PATENTING

At pages 4-5 of the office action, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-17 based on obviousness-type double patenting over co-pending application serial number 11/421,928. As that application has not issued, and all other rejections/objections to the instant application have been addressed, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness-type double patenting rejection. MPEP § 804(I)(B)(1).

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all claims pending in the patent application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issuance are earnestly solicited.

Patent Department
Boehringer Ingelheim Corp.
900 Ridgebury Road
P.O. Box 368
Ridgefield, CT. 06877
Tel.: (203) 798-4868

Dated: May 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By s/Matthew B. Dernier/
Matthew B. Dernier
Registration No.: 40,989
KAPLAN GILMAN GIBSON & DERNIER LLP
900 Route 9 North, Suite 104
Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095
(732) 634-7634
Attorneys for Applicant